

REMARKS:

In the Final Office Action of November 24, 2009, the Specification of the application was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In response, paragraph 005 of the Substitute Specification has been amended to include the language suggested by the Examiner. This added language does not add any new matter to the subject application. The language added to paragraph 005 describes what is clearly depicted in at least Figs. 2 and 3 of the drawings that were filed with the application. In addition, the Substitute Specification, and particularly paragraphs 018 to 022 thereof, provide sufficient basis for the language added at paragraph 005 thereof.

Claims 87 and 88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 87 and 88 were asserted as using language reciting "said axially extending groove" and "said groove" that was noted as having insufficient antecedent basis. It was also asserted that the recitation of "said groove" in claim 87, line 4 was unclear.

In response, claims 87 and 88 have been amended. It is believed that these claims, as presently pending, comply with 37 C.F.R. 112, second paragraph and that they particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Further, currently amended claim 87 is believed to overcome the objections to the use of the terms "said groove" at line 11 thereof. Claims 87 and 88, as currently amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

The allowance of claims 47-82 is noted, with appreciation. Several of these claims have been amended slightly to insure that uniform terminology is used throughout the claims. For example "said barrel" has been changed to "said rotating body barrel" for uniformity. These minor changes do not affect the allowability of claims 47-82.

Claims 83-86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,329,853 to Stegmeir. While it is believed, for the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed August 21, 2009 that the Examiner's interpretation of the Stegmeir reference is not correct, applicants have chosen to cancel these claims in the subject application.

The additional references cited by the Examiner in the Final Office Action of November 24, 2009 have been noted. Since they were not applied in any rejections of the claims, no discussion thereof is believed to be required.

SUMMARY:

Paragraph 005 of the Substitute Specification has been amended, without the addition of new matter, to add the language required by the Examiner. Claims 83-86 have been cancelled. Claim 87 and 88 have been amended and are believed to be allowable. Claims 47-82 have been allowed. Several of these have been slightly amended to provide uniformity of terminology.

It is believed that all of the claims which are now pending in the application are allowable. Such action and passage of the application to issue, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Martin BECKER et al.
Applicants

JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicants



Douglas R. Hanscom
Reg. No. 26,600

February 19, 2010
JONES, TULLAR & COOPER, P.C.
Customer No. 23294
P.O. Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, Virginia 22202
Phone: (703) 415-1500
Fax: (703) 415-1508
E-mail: mail@jonestullarcooper.com
Attorney Docket: W1.1982 PCT-US